

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
WWW.FINNEGAN.COM**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL****TO**

Name: Examiner Rachel Young Date: November 21, 2011
Company: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Phone Number:
Fax Number: (571) 270-2481 Total Pages (including cover): 2
Subject: U.S. Application No. 10/579,481 Confirmation Copy to Follow: No

FROM

Name: Daniel Chung Verified by: D. Chung
Student Associate | Patent Agent
Phone Number: (202) 408-4355 Our File No.: 11285.0023-00000

MESSAGE

Please see attached.

Best regards,

Daniel Chung
Student Associate | Patent Agent

If there is a problem with this transmission, notify the sender at the number above.

This facsimile is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message by first-class mail to the address below.

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW | WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413
PHONE: 202.408.4000 | FAX: 202.408.4400

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 11285.0023-00000

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Martin BUNCE) Group Art Unit: 3771
Application No.: 10/579,481) Examiner: Young, Rachel T.
Filed: April 27, 2007) Confirmation No.: 1607
For: INHALER CAP STRAP)

INTERVIEW AGENDA

FOR PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION ONLY -- NOT FOR ENTRY INTO THE RECORD

Applicant thanks Examiner Young for agreeing to schedule an interview in the above-referenced case. Applicant's representatives propose the following topics for discussion during an interview on November 22, 2011, at 10:30 a.m. EST.

1. General discussion of Applicant's claimed invention.
2. Discussion of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0089292 to Pollet et al. ("Pollet") in view of one or more of U.S. Patent No. 6,003,205 to Dehaven; U.S. Patent No. 6,164,275 to Van Iderstine; and U.S. Patent No. 5,564,583 to Kelley et al.
 - a. It would not have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Pollet as proposed by the Office Action.